DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 671 FL 013 529

TITLE	Selecting Evaluation Design: Participant's Handbook. Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance, Workshop IIB.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
PUB DATE	[80]
NOTE	47p.; For related documents, see ED 221 565-569, FL 013 523-524, FL 013 526-528, FL 013 531-532, FL 013 534-535, and FL 013 537-538.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, Los Angeles, CA 90024.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Materials (For Learner) (051)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; English (Second Language); Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Language Proficiency; *Language Tests; Limited English Speaking; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This participant's handbook for a workshop on selecting evaluation designs for bilingual programs presents group activities to facilitate learning about the selection process. The objectives of the workshop are to (1) identify the implied comparisons associated with frequently encountered evaluation questions, (2) select the most appropriate evaluation design for four different evaluation purposes, and (3) design a small evaluation for a simulated bilingual program. Three activities that will help participants achieve these objectives are described. The first activity involves analyzing a design for evaluating students' achievement in English, Swabe, and Ono reading; math; and language skills. The second activity involves deciding on the necessary comparative data and design required for a given evaluation. The third and final activity involves designing an evaluation of either an elementary or junior high school bilingual program. Sample answers are given, and a workshop participant evaluation form is appended. (NCR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227671

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance

Workshop IIB

Selecting Evaluation Design

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CSE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Participants' Handbook

Center for the Study of Evaluation

The mission of the Center for the Study of Evaluation is to conduct inquiry, from a variety of perspectives, into the nature of educational programs and services. Our commitment to inquiry into the field of evaluation grows from the belief that school practices and the competencies and satisfactions of those who participate in the educational enterprise can benefit from information collected in accordance with social science methodologies. Activities of CSE involve study of the instruments and methodologies for collecting information as well as the sociopolitical contexts of educational decisions as a means of contributing to the long-range growth in effectiveness of public education.

Information about CSE and its publications may be obtained by writing to:

Director, Public Information
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California 90024

FL013529

Table of Contents

	Page
Workshop Activities:	1
Workshop B: Selecting Evaluation Designs	
Activity #6: Identifying implied comparisons	5
Activity #7: Selecting designs	16
Activity #8: Designing and evaluation.	18

Workshop Objectives

1) Identify the implied comparisons associated with frequently encountered evaluation questions.

2) Select the most appropriate evaluation designs for four different evaluation purposes.

3) Design a small evaluation for a simulated bilingual program.

Figure 1

EVALUATION PURPOSES

AS THEY RELATE TO DESIGN

Question - How are outcome of program participants different from what would have occurred in the absence of the program?

Design Category	Equivalent Group	Non-Equivalent Group	Norm Group Comparisons
(Model #'s)	1-4	5-7	8-9
When to use:	1) Can control assignment 2) Need very generalizable results	1) Can find intact groups with same characteristics and in programs with same curriculum 2) Can get data on pre-program achievement and other possible sources of systematic group differences	1) NRT's required 2) Group comparisons required
Population	Students eligible for bilingual programs	Students eligible for bilingual programs	Students eligible for bilingual programs and representative national norm sample
Means of Assignment:	Randomly assign population from eligible population to program/no program	Matching on as many program-student variables as feasible	None: Intact classrooms and extant statistical norms
Number of Groups:	Two or more	Two or more	Two
Requirement Title VII	Program documentation: Proof that the program was implemented Pre-post achievement data: English reading, English language Achievement data on specific program objectives Documentation of parent participation Information as to how evaluation effort improved program implementation		

EVALUATION PURPOSES
AS THEY RELATE TO DESIGN

Question	How are program participants changing over time?	Do students meet acceptable standards of performance on appropriate achievement or other outcomes measures?	Which treatment(s) within the program produce better results and for whom?
Design Category	Within group	Criterion-referenced comparisons	Treatment specification
Model numbers	11-12	10	13
When to use:	To see intentional/unintentional changes of program To determine appropriate standards of achievement for bilingual groups To document program effectiveness over the funding period	Include with other designs Local outcomes are valued over other evaluation requirements	Want to improve program Want to identify variables most relevant to bilingual education Want to select best treatment
Population:	One cohort group measured often (or) New cohorts each year at same or contiguous grades, who have the same program as each othr	All pupils in bilingual program (Can compare with non-bilingual pupils)	Quantities of treatment components such as materials, minutes of instruction in a particular language, pattern of classroom organization, etc.
Means of Assignment	Select students of same age and background as those in bilingual program but not in program	All students in program and all students taking competency test	All bilingual classes with same program objectives and access to same resources
Number of groups:	One, two or more	One: two if compared to regular program	One
Minimum data requirements for Title VII	Program documentation: Proof that the program was implemented Achievement data: Related to program goals Documentation of parent participation Information as to how evaluation effort improved program implementaton		

Figure 2

IMPLIED COMPARISONS

Evaluation Question	How did students in the program do?	Did the program improve self concept and cultural awareness?	Were parents involved?
Implied comparisons	Compared to similar students Compared to English monolinguals Compared to a national norm Compared to a prespecified standard of excellence Compared to their past performance	Compared to what it was? Compared to ideal standards Compared to a non-program group's responses Compared to a scale established on a published instrument	Compared to the past Compared to non-program parents Compared to other bilingual program parents Compared to the PTA, PAC, booster club

Evaluation Question	Was the program implemented as planned?	How can the program be improved?
Implied comparisons	Compared to the course of study Compared to the description in the funding proposal Compared to what teachers said they were doing Compared to community expectations Compared to other bilingual programs Compared to other academic courses	Compared to the association of different parts Comparing the relative achievement produced by different parts of the program Comparing the affective outcomes produced by different parts of the program Comparing selected groups' (students, teachers, parents) judgment of how well they liked different parts of the program Comparing the relative implementation effort expended on different program parts

Activity 6: Implied Comparisons

Review each of the parts of the evaluation design contents and the following 8 pages. Work with others at your table to list the comparisons implied by the design. When you have listed your comparisons, turn to the next page to see what the "real-life" evaluator chose to do:

Question 1: How well are students doing in reading English?
reading Swabe?
reading Ono?

Instruments: TUF Achievement Battery: Reading Vocabulary and Comprehension
TUF-in-translation: Reading Vocabulary and Comprehension

Implied comparisons:

Feedback

Question 1: Readings

DESIGN FOR EVALUATING STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN READING

Student's achievement in English, Swabe, and Ono reading skills will be evaluated using pre-test and post-test scores on the TUF Achievement Test Battery (TUFATB). The TUFATB English provides scores on English Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension.

These comparisons will be done using data collected with these tests:

The first comparison will be a pre-test/post-test comparison which will indicate the gains achieved by the students in the bilingual Title VII program. Students will be grouped separately according to language proficiency in both English, Swabe, and Ono in making this comparison. Figure 3 below is an example of the number of language groups included in this comparison.

Figure 3

Language Groups	Test Scores		Gain	Level of Significance
	Pre-test	Post-test		
NEP				
LEP				
FEP (Bilingual) 1. Swabe 2. Ono				
FEP				

Design used to compare pre-test and post-test scores in English/Swabe and Ono reading and math; and English language obtained by Title VII students.

Students will be clustered in language groups according to their scores obtained in the Language Proficiency test given during the Fall.

A second comparison will be made using reading and vocabulary TUF scores to assess whether students in the Title VII maintenance proram are achieving at the same rate in both languages. English scores will be compared to Swabe and Ono scores. Figure 4 shows the language groups to be compared in this second comparison.

Figure 4

Language Groups	Test Scores		F - Value & Level of Significance
	Pre	Post	
English			
Bilingual	Swabe		
Swabe	Ono		
Ono			

Question 2: How well are Swabe and Ono students doing in math skills

Instrument: TUF Achievement Battery:

Implied Comparisons

Feedback

Question 2:

DESIGN FOR EVALUATING STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN MATH

Students achievement in English, Swabe, and Ono math skills will be evaluated using pre-test and post-test scores on the TUF test battery. The TUF English provides scores on computation, concepts and application.

Three comparisons will be done using data collected with these tests:

The first comparison will be a pre-test/post-test comparison which will indicate the gains achieved by the students in the bilingual Title VII program. The students' language proficiency in English, Swabe, and Ono will be used to group students in making this comparison. Figure shows an example of the number of language groups included in this comparison. Students will cluster in language groups according to their scores obtained in the Language Proficiency test given during the Fall.

A second comparison will be made using math TUF scores to assess whether students in the Title VII maintenance program are achieving at the same rate in both languages. That is, English scores will be used for the FEP and bilingual groups. Figure 4 shows the language groups to be compared in this second comparison.

Question 3: How well are Swabe and Ono students doing in language skills?

Instruments: TUF English Language Skills Test

Teacher-developed language tests in Swabe and Ono

Implied Comparisons:

Feedback

Question 3:

DESIGN FOR EVALUATING STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN LANGUAGE

Students achievement in English language skills will be evaluated using pre-test and post-test scores on the TUF English test batter. TUR English provides scores on English mechanics and spelling expression. A teacher made test of Swabe and Ono language skill was also used.

Three comparisons will be done using data collected with these tests:

The first comparison will be a pre-test/post-test comparison which will indicate the gains achieved by the students in the bilingual Title VII program. The student's language proficiency in English, Swabe, and Ono will be used to group students in making this comparison. Figure 3 is an example of the number of language groups included in this comparison.

Percentageof language skill objectives attained in Swabe, Ono, and English languages will be reported from Language Development Instruments, a criterion-referenced test battery.

Question 4: How well did students perform in writing?

Instruments: Student summarizes a story in his/her own words using the native language and again in English.

Students will write a story in his/her native language and English.

Feedback

Question 4:

DESIGN FOR EVALUATING WRITING IN ENGLISH, SWABE, AND ONO LANGUAGES

To assess students' achievement on writing skills in English, Swabe, and Ono languages, two types of writing samples will be gathered in the Fall and Spring.

One of these two samples of student writing ability will include a written repetition of a story presented to the student in English, Swabe, and Ono languages. The student will be asked to read the story and then to retell the story in his/her own terms and using his/her writing style. The second sample will include student creative writing skills. The student will be given an outline containing two subtitles of a story. The student will be asked to write the story using English for the first subtitle and the second subtitle in Swabe or Ono. These samples of stories will be then scored using a propositional and writing composition scoring; paradigm writing scores obtained by students in English, Swabe, and Ono languages will be then analyzed using designs similar to that presented in Figures 3 and 4.

Writing Sample Comparisons

	Ono	Swabe	English	Differences due to Language
Sample 1				
Sample 2				
Difference due to writing prompt				

Figure 5

REQUIREMENTS OF TYPICAL DESIGN MODELS:
A REFERENCE

Model	Comparative Data Obtained	Text Reference For Design Requirements
1. Pretest-Posttest Control Group	Equivalent Group	58-60
2. Posttest Only Control Group	Equivalent Group	61-63
3. Single Cohort Comparison	Equivalent Group	64
4. Multiple Cohort Comparison	Equivalent Group	65-66
5. Non-equivalent Control Group	Non-equivalent Groups	70-72
6. Regression Discontinuity	Non-equivalent Groups	73-75
7. Regression Projection	Non-equivalent Groups	76-77
8. Normed Pretest, Normed Posttest	National Norm Group	82-85
9. Normed Pretest-Local Pretest-Posttest	National Norm Group	86-88
10. Minimal Competency	Prespecified Achievement Standard	91-92
11. Time Series/Longitudinal	Within Group	96-97
12. Multiple Time Series	Within Group	96-97
13. Exposure to Treatment	Program to itself	101-105

Requirement for all models

1. Theory/knowledge of developmental rate of skill being examined
2. Evidence that the program existed.
3. Description of programs and comparison group "mortality" with reasons if possible.
4. Documentation of activities that may produce competing explanations of results.
5. Instruments - valid and reliable
6. Explicit criteria by which program "success" will be judged.

Figure 6

RELATIVE ADVANTAGES OF TYPICAL EVALUATION DESIGNS

Threats to Validity Countered by Design

	Sample			Instrumentation			Extraneous	
	Selection	Maturity	Mortality	Validity	Reliability	Admin. Procedures	Concurrent Programs	Hawthorne Effects
Pre-Post Control	X	X					X	
Post Control	X	X	X (somewhat)				X	
Single Cohort	X						?	
Multiple Cohort	X						?	
Non-equivalent Control	X							
Regress. Discontinuity					X			
Regress. Projection					X			
Norm Pre-Post					X			
Norm Pre/Local Pre-Post					X			
Minimum Competency		X		X				
Time Series	X	X					X	
Multiple Time Series	X	X					X	
Exposure to Treatment		X					X	X

ACTIVITY 7: Selecting Designs

Use the references provided in this handbook, Figure 5 , to complete the following chart. You are given the purpose of the evaluation. Fill in the kinds of comparative data that may be required and the design that reduces the most threats to validity for supplying that data. Compare your answers with Figure 7.

Evaluation Purpose	Implied Comparison	Design(s)
Evidence of program installation and program effectiveness over 5 year funding period		
Information for program improvement		
School district accountability		
Title VII accountability		

Figure 7

SUGGESTED DESIGNS FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

Evaluation Purpose	Design	Implied Comparison	Requirements of the Design
All purpose design to provide documentation of program development, implementation, and student achievement over time	Time Series/ Longitudinal	Within group or age/grade cohorts	1. Way to trace/document departure of students from bilingual or comparison groups to explain "mortality" 2. Tests/instruments that provide comparable data over time, e.g., same test with many levels and alternate forms, observation scales that remain the same across the period of the program evaluation or highly correlated instruments.
Identifying program strengths and weaknesses in relation to student achievement	Exposure to Treatment	Parts of the program with each other	1. Identified theory of what variables contribute to bilingual student achievement 2. Achievement instruments that measure program goals 3. Data gathering techniques that identify qualities of program implementation such as time on task, amount of curriculum covered, etc.
Accountability to school or district administration	Minimal competency	To prespecified minimal performance standard and/or to students in district outside the bilingual program	1. Basic skill/minimal competencies that bilingual students are responsible for completing 2. Reliable and valid minimal competency test 3. Defensible minimal competency standard of excellence
Reporting required norm-referenced test data for Title VII programs	Normed pretest-Local pre-posttest	National norm group Other students taking local pre and posttest	1. Norm-referenced instrument appropriate for measuring bilingual program goals. 2. Reliable and valid local criterion-referenced test that matches program goals 3. (Optional) Local norms for CRT

Activity 8:

Designing an Evaluation

In this activity, you will design an evaluation of either--an elementary or junior high school bilingual program. For this activity you will need the following reference materials:

1. Recommended Designs for Bilingual Evaluation: Refer to Figure 7 in this Handbook.
2. Descriptions of the recommended designs: Refer to Page 48 in the BETA Workshop Text II: Planning for Evaluation Design.

You may also wish to refer to Figures used in previous activities in this workshop that are in your Handbook.

Activity 8: Designing an Evaluation

Evaluation question: _____

Sample	Who	How Many	What Measures Will Be Given
students			
teachers			
parents			
other			

Instruments	Kind (check)	How Many	Information Obtained
published test			
local test			
interview			
observation			
questionnaire			
archival records			

Data Collection Schedule	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
published test										
local test										
interview										
observation										
questionnaire										
archival records										

Activity 8

Designing An Evaluation

DATA Analysis

Comparison/Information Needed to Answer Question	Instrument Used	Kind of Data	How Displayed	Analysis
(Sample answer)				
1. Reading Achievement with last year's scores.	TUF Reading Battery	Scale Scores	Bar graph of each year's posttest scores	Test significance if any found.

Simulated Program Description

The District

The _____ District has a bilingual program involving three elementary schools--Tally, Cedric, and Walpole, and the junior high school--Knoll. The elementary program is a transitional K-4 program. It has been in operation in Tally for one year, at Cedric for about four years, and at Walpole for about eight years.

There are approximately 330 elementary students in the bilingual program. Most of them (280) speak Swabe. The remaining students, 50, speak Ono. Students were selected on the basis of informal interviews by teachers, however, there is no documentation of this. Swabe is a widely spoken language and there are plenty of instructional assessment materials available, although much of it comes from a foreign country and needs adaptation. Materials in Ono are not as common, since this is a relatively small country. In fact, teachers have been making up their own materials for their students. The elementary bilingual program teaching staff consists of nine teachers. Five are bilingual Swabe/English and one is a bilingual Ono/English. Three teachers are in the process of learning Swabe to obtain certification as bilingual teachers. Each of the monolingual English speaking teachers is assisted by an aide. There are five aides in the program, four are bilingual Swabe/English and one is bilingual Ono/English.

There are approximately 123 junior high school students in the bilingual program. All of the students are speakers of Swabe. All students who are non-native English speakers are automatically placed in the regular

classroom. This determination must be made within a week of the student's enrollment at Knoll Junior High School.

There are three ESL teachers, and four bilingual teachers at Knoll.

Background Information

There is a parental advisory board which meets about every three months. However, most of their functions revolve around fund raising for sports and other extracurricular events for the elementary schools. To date they have had no substantive involvement with curricular issues. There is sparse representation of the bilingual program students' parents and there has been little effort put forth to recruit members from this part of the community because of the language barrier and because most of the parents feel they do not have the time to do this. Minutes have been kept of all the meetings and there is ample documentation of their activities.

Some inservice training is provided to school staff. Teachers and aides are given about eight days of release time a year to attend workshops. To date teachers have attended workshops on teaching of reading to limited English proficient students, and teaching social studies and science to Swabe NES and LES students. Aides have received one 3-day workshop on teaching reading and vocabulary in the native language. All workshop sessions are taped, and feedback questionnaires from the participants are kept on file. The quality and participant satisfaction with the workshops varies according to the workshop leader's proficiency and style.

The Elementary Bilingual Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the bilingual program are:

1. To help the student attain sufficient competency in the English language to ensure his/her proficiency in all areas of academic concern.
2. To develop students' cognitive and academic skills in reading and math in English and the native language.
3. To develop student self-concept and cultural pride.
4. To create and maintain a project staff of teachers, paraprofessional aides, and administrators with a high degree of expertise in their respective fields.
5. To create and maintain inservice and other instructional programs for the staff in order to enrich their professional development.
6. To promote an active and positive relationship between the schools and the community.
7. To promote a mutual support and integration of the bilingual and monolingual English programs in the schools.

The Elementary Schools

Tally Elementary has 90 students in the bilingual program, 40 who speak Ono and 50 who speak Swabe. Twenty students are in the combination grades 1 & 2 and 32 are in combination grades 2 & 3. This is the newest component of the bilingual program and it is beginning its first year.

The teacher in charge of the Ono students, Mr. L, is a former ESL teacher who has obtained certification in order to protect his job. In his view, his job was threatened by the need for bilingual teachers at the school and the shortage of funds to hire more teachers. He really doesn't feel there is a need for establishing a bilingual program for so few Ono speaking students. He apparently is not aware of the growing influx of the Ono speaking population in the area due to unrest in their native country. Because of his limited proficiency in the Ono language, Mr. L conducts all of his instruction in English and has given the Ono speaking aide, Ms. R, responsibility for conducting instruciton in Ono. He teaches reading and math every other morning and Ms. R teaches the same subjects and other content areas in the afternoons. Mr. L is confident in Ms. R's teaching skills since she had been an elementary school teacher for ten years in her native country. He also feels fortunate that Ms. R had adapted and created some reading materials in Ono for the children.

The Swabe students are in two classrooms. Ms. I, who is in charge of the combination grades 1 & 2, is a credentialed bilingual teacher who team teaches with Ms. T, who is a monolingual English speaking teacher.

Ms. I is the Swabe model and Ms. T the English model. Their class is grouped into four reading and four math groups. Other content areas are taught to the whole class, back to back. The combination grades 2 & 3 are structured similarly to the class described above. Ms. J, and ESL teacher who is in the process of obtaining certification as a bilingual (Swabe/ English), works with a bilingual aide.

The principal of the school, Mr. Jones, has mixed feelings about bilingual education. He doesn't see any differences between ESL and bilingual education. However, he is willing to do anything within reason to provide a good education to the limited English speaking students and, most of all, to get their achievement scores up. He hopes that this year's evaluation will show some improvement in this area.

Cedric Elementary. This school has 120 students in the bilingual program: 70 in grades 1 & 2; 50 in grades 2 & 3; and 23 in grades 3 & 4. The teachers for grades 1 & 2 and 2 & 3, Mrs. H and Mr. W respectively, are certified bilingual teachers. Each is assisted by a bilingual Swabe/ English speaking aide.

Mrs. H has only been teaching for two years and strongly favors the bilingual program. However, she feels that more certified bilingual personnel are needed as well as more follow up of the students who have been exited from the program. Mr. W, who has been teaching for six years, is disillusioned with bilingual education and teaching in general. He feels that the process is long and arduous and that teachers as well as administrators must constantly battle red tape and paperwork which interfere with classroom teaching. He is especially critical of over testing and the use of irrelevant and possibly damaging tests.

Both Mrs. H and Mr. W have structured their classrooms around reading and math groups. However, the number of groups per grade per subject in each classroom has become difficult to handle. They are seeking other ways of structuring their classrooms but the wide range of their students' language and math skills both in English and their native language make this a difficult task.

The teacher for the 3/4 combination, Ms. M is a monolingual English speaker who is seeking certification by taking the appropriate course work. She is also assisted by an aide and team teaches with a monolingual English speaking teacher, Ms. S. Ms. M is very much in favor of the bilingual program because she has been teaching at Cedric for many years and has seen the difficulties which the school had to encounter when it tried to provide a good education to large numbers of Nes/Les students by relying on a rather weak ESL program. In Ms. M's opinion, the bilingual program director, and the school principal, Mrs. Hoover, had integrated former ESL personnel such as herself and other ESL teachers and aides. She also feels they have recognized the potential value of an ESL component within the bilingual program.

Ms. M has divided her class into three English reading levels and works with each group separately in English language skills. All other areas are taught to the class as a whole. She relies heavily upon her aide for providing instruction in the native language to the students. Ms. M gives her aide very careful and detailed lesson plans on math and reading in the native language. However, Ms. M feels that her aide needs more education and she is not quite sure about the aide's effectiveness.

The school principal, Mrs. Hoover, is aware of Mr. W's frame of mind and has suggested that he take a "leave from classroom teaching and become

a resource teacher for the bilingual unit. She feels he could make a contribution in improving the assessment problems and other areas of the program.

Mrs. Hoover feels that the program, which is in its 4th year, is successful although the achievement scores would not indicate this. However, she feels that the general attitude of the students in the program has improved. Furthermore, students who have transitioned into the regular English program are faring better than their pre-bilingual program predecessors. One of her goals for this year is to devise a plan for a formal follow up of those transitioned students up until they reach junior high.

Walpole elementary has 120 students in the bilingual program: 32 in grade 1; 27 in grade 2; 28 in grade 3; and 33 in grade 4. The teachers in grades 1 and 2, Mr. I and Mr. S, are bilingual teachers. Ms. Z, the grade 3 teacher is an ESL teacher who is studying for certification as a bilingual teacher. Ms. J, who teaches the fourth grade class is not a certified bilingual teacher and plans to retire from the teaching field at the end of the year. She is assisted by a bilingual aide.

The Walpole program is in its eighth year. All classrooms are self contained and the bilingual teachers use whatever methods they feel work best in instruction. Students are transitioned after being in the program for two years or if they pass the English language proficiency test developed by the teachers and achieve at the stanine on the TUF achievement test.

Mr. Smith, the principal, does not favor the bilingual program. He feels that the majority of the students do not achieve at the same level as the students in the regular monolingual English program. Furthermore,

he has followed up a few of the students through their first year in junior high and he concludes that the bilingual program is ineffective. However, there has been no systematic or documented follow up of students exiting the bilingual program. Mr. Smith would rather see limited English students attend an ESL course until they are ready to join the regular program.

Evaluation Criteria for the Elementary Program

Exit criteria: This has been a source of confusion and contention among the bilingual program director, the principals and members of the school board. The board and some of the principals feel that students who achieve at the stanine in math and reading in English, should be transferred out of the bilingual program. They also feel that if a student has been in the bilingual program for two years, he/she should be ready to join the regular monolingual English program. The bilingual program director and some of the principals feel that these criteria are not adequate for several reasons. First of all, they feel that the standardized achievement test used to measure reading and math in English is biased against the bilingual program students, due to cultural bias in the items and their lack of relevance to the curriculum. Although they would agree to including student achievement scores in reading and math in English on a more appropriate standardized test, they feel that this would not be enough. In addition, they would like to administer an "exit" language proficiency test which would examine writing and listening comprehension in English as well as reading and speaking skills. They would also prefer to use a district developed criterion referenced test relevant to their curriculum in: language skills in English, and math, social studies and science in English or the native language. The purpose of this would be to see whether exiting students are entering the monolingual English program with the same kinds of skills and knowledge as their peers. Neither the bilingual program staff nor the monolingual English program staff has examined the similarities or differences between the curricula of the two programs. Although they both contain similar

(and in some cases the same) objectives, the instructional materials are different as are the teaching strategies. The present situation within the bilingual program is that each school has its own transfer criteria. In the older programs, such as those in Cedric and Walpole Elementary schools, students must exit the program after 2 1/2 years. Tally Elementary school has placed no time limit and relies on achievement scores and informal teacher assessment to determine transfer eligibility. No formal follow up procedures have been set up for the bilingual program students who have transferred.

Outcomes: Of the two schools, Cedric/Walpole Elementary schools have tested their students on a yearly basis with a standardized achievement test on reading and math in English. This has been done for students in grades 2, 3 and 4. Most of the bilingual program students have scored lower than the students in the monolingual English program. The gap widens as the children get older. The bilingual program director blames the inadequacy of the test and the newness of the programs for these results. Board members and principals have various opinions about how to go about improving student achievement. Some board members and principals feel that greater emphasis should be placed on English language skills in the curriculum and teaching strategies. Others feel that students need more strengthening of basic skills in their own language and in English before they can do well in the monolingual English program. Neither the board nor the majority of the principals have discussed this issue with the parental advisory board. The bilingual program director and the principal of Walpole Elementary feel that more parental involvement in the schools could indirectly and positively affect student achievement by improving

students' self-image and study habits at home. Some of the teachers and the bilingual program director feel that it is unfair to compare the performance of bilingual program and monolingual English program students.

The Junior High School

Knoll Junior High has had an ESL component for seven years. Ms. K, the bilingual program director, has been trying to implement a transitional bilingual program here for the past two years. Her rationale is that the Swabe population has been steadily increasing with a sharp rise in recent immigration. Swabe students have increased from 89 last year to 123 this year. Most of the new Swabe students were non-English speakers. Furthermore, the incidence of high-school dropouts has always been high for these students. Ms. K and Ms. Neuman, who has been principal at this school for three years, feel that the bilingual program may enhance student self-concept and provide additional instruction which could be beneficial to the Swabe students and have a positive effect on the dropout rate.

The teaching staff has had mixed reactions to the change. Overall, the teachers at Knoll feel that the school has a responsibility to try to provide a good education to all of its students. However, there is some skepticism about bilingual education. Others fear a separation between the staff in the bilingual program and the regular English program staff. The three ESL teachers (who had been at Knoll from 3-5 years) feared for their jobs at first. However, these fears have not materialized.

One teacher, Ms. D, is studying toward the bilingual certification. In the meantime, she provides instruction for the most advanced LES students with the help of a bilingual aide. Mr. N is team teaching with a new bilingual teacher, Ms. Q. They teach the non-English proficient and very limited English proficient students. Ms. J, another ESL teacher, has decided to teach social studies, paying particular attention to LEP students in her class. Four bilingual teachers have been hired since the

program began. Two teachers instruct beginning and intermediate LEP students and two instruct intermediate and advanced bilingual program students. The principal and bilingual program director felt that it would be more efficient to group students according to their language proficiency since this criterion determines what language they will receive instruction in in other content areas such as science and social studies. The beginning and intermediate students receive instruction in math and other content areas back to back in both languages. However, the advanced bilingual students take some courses in the regular English program before they actually transition. Their performance in these courses is one of the transition criteria for these students.

Evaluation Criteria for the Junior High Program

Exit criteria: Students will be exited from the bilingual program upon fulfillment of the following criteria:

1. At least one year in the program.
2. Scores in the 3rd stanine on English language skills and math on the TUF standardized achievement test.
3. Satisfactory performance (or better) in a regular English program course.

The same controversies exist over these transitional criteria as for those of the elementary school program. The program director and principal are considering the deletion of #3 above because of possible traumatic effects on a student who "cannot make it" in regular classes. However, some of the board members feel that this is a good way to find out whether a student is ready to transition.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

Workshop title: _____

Position/Job title: _____

Date: _____

Please place a check in the space below each question that summarizes your opinion about the materials used for this workshop.

I. 1. The materials are helpful for evaluators who are not familiar with specific problems in evaluating compensatory and specially funded programs.

_____very _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

2. The materials are helpful for people with no experience in evaluation.

_____very _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

3. The purpose of the workshop was communicated clearly in the materials.

_____yes _____no

4. Content was presented in a logical, easy to follow order.

_____yes _____no

5. The order of presentation of topics in the text promoted retention.

_____very much _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

6. The content in the workshop was new to you.

_____yes, completely _____yes, mostly _____no, most was familiar; no, all familiar

7. The language of the materials was appropriate for the audience.

_____yes _____no

II. 1. How practical do you think the information in the text is to your evaluation on training needs?

_____very _____rather _____difficult to see its use _____no utility

2. What would be your recommendation to a colleague regarding these materials?

_____strongly recommend _____recommend _____not recommend

_____strongly not recommend

III. COMMENTS

1. What are the strongest sections of the text? _____

_____

_____

2. What are the weakest sections of the text? _____

_____

_____

3. What topics need to be included? _____

_____

_____

4. Other _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____